

CITY OF REDMOND TRAILS COMMISSION

MINUTES — January 28, 2004 Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson Gary Smith, Maureen McCoy, Julie Barnfather, Kris Colt; Youth Advocate Emily Thompson

ABSENT: Sue Chenault, Glenn Eades, Ken Bechmann

CITY STAFF: Tim Cox, Manager of Parks Planning; Sarah Stiteler, Planning Department; Pam Maybee, Recording Secretary

AUDIENCE: None

Note: Bold/italic text denotes Staff and Commissioner follow-up resulting from this meeting.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gary Smith called to order the regular meeting of the Redmond Trails Commission (RTC) at 7:05 p.m. at the Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center (ORSCC).

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Redmond Trails Commission Minutes of December 10, 2003 were approved with the following amendments:

- Page 5, fourth paragraph from numbered items: Delete, "What could be standardized to work for everybody?" and add, "What would be the best compromise when the soft surface and hard surface trails must be merged due to space limitations?"

Motion for approval of December 10, 2003 RTC minutes as amended by: Commissioner McCoy
Second by: Commissioner Barnfather
Motion carried: Unanimous 4-0

III. ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE

None

IV. ITEMS OF INTEREST/HANDOUTS

A. Revised Draft Redmond TMP 2004 Calendar

Commissioners reviewed a handout of a summary of activities scheduled by Public Works and the Planning Department associated with the TMP (Transportation Master Plan) and Comp Plan transportation chapter of non-motorized transportation items. Cox noted that some trails were moved into the TMP element in the non-motorized section, thereby establishing a partnership with Parks, Public Works and Planning.

Cox reported that conformation was received of the \$180,000 IAC grant for the Bear Creek Trail construction at Bear Creek Park. Negotiations with WADOT necessary to secure that money have opened the way for \$457,000 of funding through the TEA-21 grant, minimizing the impact to the CIP budget.

B. Downtown Master Plan Consultant Presentation Report

Commissioner Colt and Park Board Chair Lori Snodgrass attended the January 21 meeting for the Downtown Master Plan. Consultants presented their three design ideas for a downtown master plan, including transit stations, multi-use, and commercial. Colt noted that one idea had placed a parking structure in the middle of the BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe) right-of-way. Cox noted that Parks and Recreation did not receive notice of the meeting. Cox further explained that with the passage of a possible Park Bond, Park money would be used to acquire the BNSF, which would bring a new perspective to usage of the right-of-way.

V. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS

A. Comprehensive Plan Trail Policies

Sarah Stiteler, Planning Department, explained that the City, by law, is required to update the Comprehensive Plan in terms of growth in the next 20-year period. The focus on this update would be on supply and diversity of new housing and transportation strategies. The City Council and Planning Commission have indicated a preference for broad strategies and framework policies to address the vision within chapter policies.

Stiteler asked Commissioners to give input on how they would like to envision change in the City, and how policies relating to trails would articulate that vision. She announced a joint meeting would take place on February 18, 2004, 7:00-9:00 p.m., with members from the Planning Commission, Arts Commission, Park Board, and Trails Commission. All Commissioners were invited, yet two from each Commission would be acceptable. She will e-mail the invitation as well, so as to notify those absent from this meeting.

Cox noted Policy FW-21 and 27 incorporate concepts dealing with trails. Stiteler asked Commissioners to look at the policies that need to be reconsidered, shifted, etc.

Colt referred to the goal of establishing a hierarchy of trails. She wanted to ensure the ability to enforce connector trails in developments, that they would not be lost due to the code for maximum trail count. Cox referenced page 206, where it coded "25 miles per 1,000 population." He reasoned that if all trails were included in this code (trails in parks, on street frontage, pathways, connections within private developments, etc.), then the standard would be exceeded—clearly, that cannot be what it means. He reported that Parks' staff is working on understanding more clearly trails as a comprehensible hierarchy. Therefore in attempt to meet a specific standard, this code might be misunderstood. In reality, the LOS (level of service) standards have not been met. He suggested adding verbiage such as, "City facilities within the City limits." However, more words would be needed, for example, regarding sidewalks within the park system. He noted that public trails are administrated through the CIP, and private trails are administrated through zoning codes.

Colt referenced the Developers Handout, which, she emphasized, should be given by the Planning Department to every developer. The trail hierarchy is included in the handout. She would like to see a hierarchy and an ideal standard; however, compromise may exist on a case-by-case basis (e.g., Bear-Evans Creek Trail). Cox noted the need for greater clarity in the policies. Staff has been discussing segmenting PR-14A, the multi-use trail definition, into a couple of different types. For

example: (1) Bridle Crest would always be a soft surface trail for multi-use, and therefore should have a soft surface trail designation, and (2) there are also collector trails, multi-use, and those adjacent to major arterials.

Stiteler suggested there be a hierarchy to address the various users within the City. Details and specifics would be outlined in the PRO Plan as the implementing mechanism of the Comp Plan. Colt emphasized that the Comp Plan would need to have a driving force in its verbiage to direct people to the PRO Plan. Cox added staff must be diligent to enforce that, and he believed that they could.

Cox noted inventory, definition, etc., should not be in the Comp Plan, only policies. There should be no duplication of details in the two documents (Comp Plan and PRO Plan). Stiteler asked Commissioners if the existing policies covered the issues adequately to envision future needs.

Cox highlighted the policies containing specific reference to trails: FPR-1, PR-2, 3, 7, 8, 13, 14, 14A, 19 (item 6), 30-33, 37, 48-50. Within the Trails section: FPR-5, PR-51 through 69, and special trails Art Loop and Riverwalk. Stiteler noted anything listing FPR would be removed from individual chapters and put in a separate section. The goal is to be inclusive, not repetitive. Cox added there were 40 trail policies, some obsolete, incomplete, not there, and/or needing embellishment.

Commissioners made the following general comments and suggestions on the policies:

PR-13:

- Keep the last sentence (i.e., reference to the west side trail, and working with the County).
- State both east and west sides of the entire river corridor, e.g., "The trail right-of-way on both sides..."
- Remove habitat focus/references.

PR-14:

- Out of date, since part of Willows was abandoned (from Willows, east), and is no longer in use as a rail line.
- Delete "If the right-of-way..." Begin sentence with, "The railroad right-of-way along..."

PR-15:

- Put this policy back in the next version (1999 version omitted this by mistake; it was included in the 12/1997 version).
- Strengthen language with reference to the Sammamish River and Lakes to Locks.

- Must stress getting into the water and “water related travel,” e.g., boat activity, Lakes to Locks on the Sammamish River Trail, etc.
- Delete “resources”; rather, reference “water trail access” or “provide access to water trails.”
- Suggested verbiage: “Encourage promotion of environmentally sound access and use of water trails.” (not “property”)

Barnfather observed the word “hierarchy” was not an accurate term of reference since it meant “dependent on use.” Colt suggested using “types” of trails instead. A hierarchy could be used when referring to larger regional trails, but neighborhood trails would be on a different level. Clarification is needed of definition and what is appropriate for the space.

PR-19, item 6:

- Redundant to PR-31
- Leave in PR-19, and put PR-31 under Section 5 (Trails).
- The Bikeway Plan referenced has a broader view with King County.
- A non-motorized Bike Plan is in the Comp Plan in the transportation element.
- Consolidate 14-A, PR-19 (item 6), and PR-30 to a more powerful statement.

PR-30:

- Could break up into a couple of different ideas (possibly include in the trails section).

PR-31 and PR-33:

- Delete these two policies.

PR-32:

- “Coordinate planning of bikeways with planning of non-motorized element of the Transportation Master Plan” (substitute “Trails Plan” with “non-motorized transportation”).

G. Recreational Trails

- Paragraphs only focus on trails as recreational; however, should include transportation trails concept: either in “G” as a dual concept, or list transportation trails in its own section.
- Hierarchy comes down to site specifics. Ask, Would it also be used for transportation? Define transportation.

Equestrian Trails: PR-63 through PR-69

- Needs simplification (e.g., delete crushed rock)
- Emphasize these details in the PRO Plan (Colt noted PR-63 through 69 were put in the previous version to ensure avoidance of past problems).
- *Barnfather will work with Colt to simplify the equestrian section and report new wording to Stiteler.*

- Stiteler noted construction specific language would appear in the PRO Plan.

Table PR-11

- Delete NRPA standard and Consultant recommended LOS (obsolete).
- Delete “Park Board Recommendation,” and add “Planning target” (it is a goal, a higher standard to achieve).

Specialty Trails:

- Add waterways for specialty trails.
- Could consider deleting specialty trails; include them elsewhere in the policy text.

Commissioners may e-mail any further comments on policies to Stiteler.

Stiteler reported she is also working on a non-motorized transportation map, noting there is a planning effort moving forward toward the goal of consolidating the trails in terms of their function. GRTMA (Greater Redmond Transportation Management Association) approached Planning with a request for an additional map to hand out to bicyclists and recreational trail users. Stiteler referenced a Bicycling Guide map from Bellevue as a sample format to follow. She asked for edits/updates to the existing map from Commissioners, as well as from the PBAC (Pedestrian-Bicycle Advisory Committee) and staff. ***Commissioners will mark up the existing Redmond trails and bike map with their suggestions and forward them to Stiteler.*** She noted there is money available to print a new map (anticipated in mid-May).

Cox also reminded Commissioners of the Surrey, B.C. map they reviewed in the past as an example to achieve. He noted the different back to the map, including sections of explanation. Parks and Recreation could print a “second run” map (a spin off) from the map that Stiteler is creating, customizing the back, etc. It would be an opportunity to get a bigger map, which is the goal.

B. 2003 Maintenance and Operations Summary Report

Postponed to next month’s meeting.

**C. Joint Meeting with PBAC (Pedestrian Bicycle Advisory Committee)
– 2/11/04**

Cox referenced a memo with a summary of possible discussion items for the joint meeting with the PBAC. Commissioners also reviewed a new draft with an abbreviated version generated at last week’s PBAC meeting. Cox noted the PBAC would like the meeting to be limited to action, time constraint, and number of topics.

Colt asked to focus on the non-motorized element of the TMP (Transportation Master Plan), not the TMP with a consultant giving a presentation. ***Commissioners agreed to not have a consultant present, or discuss the TMP.***

Smith asked to delete these items: Citizen Awareness (last bulleted item in memo), TMP Presentation etc. (#4), and East Lake Sammamish Trail (#5). He requested adding a Trails Day Event discussion and putting BNSF as a higher priority on the list.

Cox emphasized the Sammamish River Trail should be a high priority, and to include the bridge (linking PSE). It could be discussed along with the Willows/Rose Hill trail. ***Cox will bring the existing and proposed trails map, showing the east and west Rose Hill/Willows trail for reference and clarity.***

Smith asked Cox to get background material ahead of time regarding the definition of motorized vehicles and what is allowed. ***Cox will print out that portion of the Municipal code and have as hard copy for the meeting.***

Prioritized discussion topics:

1. Trails functionality (commuting vs. recreation)
2. BNSF right-of-way
3. Ped/Bike proposed trails: Rose Hill ***(Barnfather will speak on the trail, since she has hiked it) (Smith will ask Arnie Tomac whether or not to drop the 520 discussion)***
4. Sammamish River enhancement, trail and bridge included ***(Colt will initiate discussion regarding the 12-foot trail widening)***
5. Accessibility and appropriate users ***(Smith will speak on the Segway, and other electric vehicles, defining what is non-motorized transportation)***
6. June 5th Trails Day event

The joint meeting will be held 2/11/04, 6:30 p.m., at ORSCC Room 103, and is in lieu of RTC's end of month February meeting.

D. National Trails Day – June 5, 2004

Smith asked Commissioners to be thinking of ideas for the event in June.

E. Commission "Talk Time"

(See Comp Plan discussion V.A.)

F. Municipal Campus Park Charette

Cox referenced the handout of the Municipal Campus master plan Charette agenda. Commissioners were asked to attend. *Smith will call absentee Commissioners from this meeting to solicit a representative.*

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Smith at 9:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Pam Maybee

**THE NEXT REDMOND TRAILS COMMISSION MEETING:
Joint Meeting with Pedestrian-Bicycle Advisory Committee
Wednesday, February 11, 2004
Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center
6:30 p.m.**